UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/621,067	07/16/2003	Keith Farkas	200210109-1	1252

22879 7590 01/23/2009

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
TANG, KENNETH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/23/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/621,067	FARKAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KENNETH TANG	2195	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 November 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,7,8,15 and 17-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1, 2, 7-8, 15, 17-19, 22-28, and 30-31* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *20,21 and 29* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 15, and 17-31 are presented for examination.

2. This action is in response to the Amendment on 11/17/08. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but were not found to be persuasive.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 20-21 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as well as overcoming the Double Patenting rejections.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. "A later patent claim is not patentably distinct from an earlier patent claim if the later claim is obvious over, or anticipated by, the earlier claim. In re Longi, 759 F.2d at 896, 225 USPQ at 651 (affirming a holding of obviousness-type double patenting because the claims at issue were obvious over claims in four prior art patents).

6. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 in view of Yamaji et al. (hereinafter Yamaji).

7. As to claim 1, U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 teaches a computer system, comprising:

a plurality of computer processor cores in which at least two differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set (col. 8, lines 50-53); and

a performance measurement (col. 8, lines 61-63) and transfer mechanism for distributing a plurality of computer processing jobs amongst the plurality of computer processor cores (col. 8, lines 64-67).

8. U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 is silent in disclosing that the transfer mechanism is done based on a measured throughput metric.

9. However, Yamaji teaches a multiprocessing system that transfers jobs based on a throughput coefficient metric (col. 4, lines 21-26 and 60-63, col. 1, lines 5-15). One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2's multiprocessing system such that it would migrate jobs to its various cores based on a throughput coefficient

metric, as taught in Yamaji's multiprocessing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of maximizing processing capacity, which thereby shortens the average processing time of a job (col. 3, lines 33-43).

10. Claim 7 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 14 of U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 in view of Yamaji et al. (hereinafter Yamaji).

11. As to claim 7, U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 teaches a method for operating multiple processor cores, comprising:

placing a plurality of computer processor cores on a single semiconductor die, in which at least two computer processor cores differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set (col. 10, lines 39-46);

measuring the performance of each of a plurality of computer processing jobs hosted amongst the plurality of computer processor cores (col. 10, lines 49-51); and

transferring individual ones of said plurality of computer processing jobs amongst targeted ones of said plurality of computer processor cores to improve a throughput metric (col. 10, lines 52-55).

12. U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2 is explicitly silent in obtaining a throughput metric that identifies throughput achieved by the computer processor cores as a function of workloads running on said computer processor cores. However, Yamaji teaches a multiprocessing system that transfers jobs based on a throughput coefficient metric that is a function of workload data (col. 4, lines 21-26 and 60-63, col. 1, lines 5-15). One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify U.S. Patent No. 7,093,147 B2's multiprocessing system such that it would migrate jobs to its various cores based on a throughput coefficient metric that is a function of workload data, as taught in Yamaji's multiprocessing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of maximizing processing capacity, which thereby shortens the average processing time of a job (col. 3, lines 33-43).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1, 2, 7-8, 15, 17-19, 22-23, 25-28, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstien et al. (hereinafter Orenstien) (US 2003/0110012 A1) in view of Dean et al. (hereinafter Dean) (US 6,332,178 B1).

14. As to claim 1, Orenstien teaches a computer system, comprising:

a plurality of computer processor cores in which at least two differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set ([0017], [0022]-[0023]); and

a performance measurement (power consumption metric or alternatively, a load measurement that is used to in the load balancing between the processor cores) (page 2, last line of [0021]) and transfer mechanism for distributing a plurality of computer processing jobs amongst the plurality of computer processor cores to improve a throughput metric (tracking and migration of processes from one core to the other in a dual core processor 200 to increase throughput) ([0020]-[0021], [0027], and [0034], lines 1-2).

15. In summary of the above citations, Orenstien teaches a computer system monitoring the operational activity of its dual-core processor 200 to provide load balancing between the cores by migrating processes from one core to the other based on a performance metric. Orenstien teaches that the performance metric, for example, can be based on power, or load for load balancing, or other things. The result of this migration based on the monitoring of the performance measurement is an increase in throughput or clock frequency for each core. Orenstien teaches that the system does ensure that "processing throughput is increased to the extent possible" (page 4, [0034], lines 1-2).

16. Orenstien is explicitly silent in teaching that the transferring is based on a measured throughput metric. However, Dean teaches a multiprocessing system that uses throughput/latency metrics to determine the migration of jobs (col. 3, lines 10-11 and 25-30, col. 12, lines 28-35 and 63 through col. 13, line 55). Orenstien and Dean are analogous art because

they are both in the same field of endeavor of multiprocessing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Orenstien such that it would migrate jobs to its various cores based on a measured thoughput/latency metric. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of optimizing the system, instruction scheduling, allocation, etc. (col. 2, lines 19-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Orenstien and Dean to obtain the invention of claim 1.

17. As to claim 2, Orenstien teaches further comprising: at least one of an operating system (operating system 755, [0041]-[0042]), hosted on the plurality of computer processor cores, firmware ([0026]), and special-purpose hardware that includes the performance measurement and transfer mechanism (monitor 110, [0020]-[0021]), and that provides for a periodic test to determine relative performance of different jobs on different ones of the plurality of computer processor cores (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced) ([0021], [0027]).

18. As to claim 7, Orenstien teaches a method for operating multiple processor cores, comprising:

placing a plurality of computer processor cores on a single semiconductor die, in which at least two computer processor cores differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set ([0022]-[0023], [0017]);

measuring the performance amongst the plurality of computer processor cores ([0017], [0022]-[0023]); and

transferring individual ones of said plurality of computer processing jobs amongst targeted ones of said plurality of computer processor cores to improve a throughput metric (tracking and migration of processes from one core to the other in a dual core processor 200 to increase throughput) ([0020]-[0021], [0027], and [0034], lines 1-2).

19. In summary of the above citations, Orenstien teaches a computer system monitoring the operational activity of its dual-core processor 200 to provide load balancing between the cores by migrating processes from one core to the other based on a performance metric. Orenstien teaches that the performance metric, for example, can be based on power, or load for load balancing, or other things. The result of this migration based on the monitoring of the performance measurement is an increase in throughput or clock frequency for each core. Orenstien teaches that the system does ensure that "processing throughput is increased to the extent possible" (page 4, [0034], lines 1-2).

20. Orenstien is explicitly silent in obtaining a throughput metric that identifies throughput achieved by the computer processor cores as a function of workloads running on said computer processor cores. However, Dean teaches a multiprocessing system that uses detailed performance information such as load, throughput/latency metrics to determine the migration of jobs (col. 3, lines 10-11 and 25-30, col. 12, lines 28-35 and 63 through col. 13, line 55). Orenstien and Dean are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor of multiprocessing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Orenstien such

that it would migrate jobs to its various cores based on a measured thoughput/latency metric. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of optimizing the system, instruction scheduling, allocation, etc. (col. 2, lines 19-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Orenstien and Dean to obtain the invention of claim 7.

21. As to claim 8, Orenstien teaches providing for a periodic test to determine relative performance of different jobs on different ones of the computer processor cores (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced) ([0021], [0027]).

22. As to claim 15, Orenstien teaches further comprising: associating workloads for execution on specific processor cores based on at least one of user and application hints ([0042]).

23. As to claim 17, Orenstien teaches further comprising at least one of an operating system hosted on the plurality of computer processor cores (multi-core), firmware, and special-purpose hardware that includes the performance measurement and transfer mechanism ([0041], [0026]).

24. As to claim 18, Orenstien teaches wherein the performance measurement and transfer mechanism improves the total system throughput. Orenstien also teaches wherein the throughput is maximized by disclosing that the processing throughput is increased to the extent possible (page 4, [0033], lines 1-2).

25. As to claim 19, Orenstien teaches wherein the performance measurement and transfer mechanism periodically transfers the executing computer processing jobs to a new assignment amongst the plurality of computer processor cores, collects performance statistics about execution at the new assignment, and then determines whether to reassign the executing computer processing jobs to different computer processor cores based on the performance statistics collected (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced via process migration between cores) ([0021], [0027]).

26. As to claim 22, Orenstien teaches wherein the determination of whether to reassign the jobs to different computer processor cores also is based on at least one of user-defined or workload-defined metrics (information can be provided by user, the program itself, or the execution of the program) ([0042]).

27. As to claim 23, Dean teaches wherein the throughput metric comprises a number of instructions per second (col. 12, lines 28-35).

28. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 1 and 7.

29. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 8.

30. As to claims 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 18-19, respectively.

31. As to claims 30-31, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 22-23, respectively.

32. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstien et al. (hereinafter Orenstien) (US 2003/0110012 A1) in view of Dean et al. (hereinafter Dean)

(US 6,332,178 B1), and further in view of Diepstraten et al. (hereinafter Diepstraten) (US 6,986,141 B1).

33. As to claim 24, Orenstien and Dean are silent wherein movement of the executing computer processing jobs is constrained to occur only at operating system time slice intervals. However, Diepstraten teaches having time slice task switching capability in its switching or processes (col. 1, lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Orenstien's migration of processes to include the feature of wherein the movement of the executing computer processing jobs is constrained to occur only at operating system time slice intervals. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of a more flexible way to allocate and manage context (col. 3, lines 44-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Orenstien, Dean, and Diepstraten to obtain the invention of claim 24.

34. Claims 1, 2, 7-8, 15, 17-19, 22-28, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Orenstien et al. (hereinafter Orenstien) (US 2003/0110012 A1) in view of Yamaji et al. (hereinafter Yamaji).

35. As to claim 1, Orenstien teaches a computer system, comprising:

a plurality of computer processor cores in which at least two differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set ([0017], [0022]-[0023]); and

a performance measurement (power consumption metric or alternatively, a load measurement that is used to in the load balancing between the processor cores) (page 2, last line of [0021]) and transfer mechanism for distributing a plurality of computer processing jobs amongst the plurality of computer processor cores to improve a throughput metric (tracking and migration of processes from one core to the other in a dual core processor 200 to increase throughput) ([0020]-[0021], [0027], and [0034], lines 1-2).

36. In summary of the above citations, Orenstien teaches a computer system monitoring the operational activity of its dual-core processor 200 to provide load balancing between the cores by migrating processes from one core to the other based on a performance metric. Orenstien teaches that the performance metric, for example, can be based on power, or load for load balancing, or other things. The result of this migration based on the monitoring of the performance measurement is an increase in throughput or clock frequency for each core. Orenstien teaches that the system does ensure that "processing throughput is increased to the extent possible" (page 4, [0034], lines 1-2).

37. Orenstien is explicitly silent in teaching that the transferring is based on a measured throughput metric. However, Yamaji teaches a multiprocessing system that transfers jobs based on a throughput coefficient metric (col. 4, lines 21-26 and 60-63, col. 1, lines 5-15). Orenstien and Yamaji are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor of multiprocessing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Orenstien's

multiprocessing system such that it would migrate jobs to its various cores based on a throughput coefficient metric, as taught in Yamaji's multiprocessing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of maximizing processing capacity, which thereby shortens the average processing time of a job (col. 3, lines 33-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Orenstien and Yamaji to obtain the invention of claim 1.

38. As to claim 2, Orenstien teaches further comprising: at least one of an operating system (operating system 755, [0041]-[0042]), hosted on the plurality of computer processor cores, firmware ([0026]), and special-purpose hardware that includes the performance measurement and transfer mechanism (monitor 110, [0020]-[0021]), and that provides for a periodic test to determine relative performance of different jobs on different ones of the plurality of computer processor cores (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced) ([0021], [0027]).

39. As to claim 7, Orenstien teaches a method for operating multiple processor cores, comprising:

placing a plurality of computer processor cores on a single semiconductor die, in which at least two computer processor cores differ in processing performance, and in which all execute the same instruction set ([0022]-[0023], [0017]);

measuring the performance amongst the plurality of computer processor cores ([0017], [0022]-[0023]); and

transferring individual ones of said plurality of computer processing jobs amongst targeted ones of said plurality of computer processor cores to improve a throughput metric (tracking and migration of processes from one core to the other in a dual core processor 200 to increase throughput) ([0020]-[0021], [0027], and [0034], lines 1-2).

40. In summary of the above citations, Orenstien teaches a computer system monitoring the operational activity of its dual-core processor 200 to provide load balancing between the cores by migrating processes from one core to the other based on a performance metric. Orenstien teaches that the performance metric, for example, can be based on power, or load for load balancing, or other things. The result of this migration based on the monitoring of the performance measurement is an increase in throughput or clock frequency for each core. Orenstien teaches that the system does ensure that "processing throughput is increased to the extent possible" (page 4, [0034], lines 1-2).

41. Orenstien is explicitly silent in obtaining a throughput metric that identifies throughput achieved by the computer processor cores as a function of workloads running on said computer processor cores. However, Yamaji teaches a multiprocessing system that transfers jobs based on a throughput coefficient metric that is a function of workload data (col. 4, lines 21-26 and 60-63, col. 1, lines 5-15). Orenstien and Yamaji are analogous art because they are both in the same field of endeavor of multiprocessing. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to modify Orenstien's multiprocessing system such that it would migrate jobs to its various cores

based on a throughput coefficient metric that is a function of workload data, as taught in Yamaji's multiprocessing system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the predicted result of maximizing processing capacity, which thereby shortens the average processing time of a job (col. 3, lines 33-43). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Orenstien and Yamaji to obtain the invention of claim 7.

42. As to claim 8, Orenstien teaches providing for a periodic test to determine relative performance of different jobs on different ones of the computer processor cores (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced) ([0021], [0027]).

43. As to claim 15, Orenstien teaches further comprising: associating workloads for execution on specific processor cores based on at least one of user and application hints ([0042]).

44. As to claim 17, Orenstien teaches further comprising at least one of an operating system hosted on the plurality of computer processor cores (multi-core), firmware, and special-purpose hardware that includes the performance measurement and transfer mechanism ([0041], [0026]).

45. As to claim 18, Orenstien teaches wherein the performance measurement and transfer mechanism improves the total system throughput. Orenstien also teaches wherein the throughput is maximized by disclosing that the processing throughput is increased to the extent possible (page 4, [0033], lines 1-2).

46. As to claim 19, Orenstien teaches wherein the performance measurement and transfer mechanism periodically transfers the executing computer processing jobs to a new assignment amongst the plurality of computer processor cores, collects performance statistics about execution at the new assignment, and then determines whether to reassign the executing computer processing jobs to different computer processor cores based on the performance statistics collected (relative performance of each core is periodically monitored and evaluated such that the load can be leveled or balanced via process migration between cores) ([0021], [0027]).

47. As to claim 22, Orenstien teaches wherein the determination of whether to reassign the jobs to different computer processor cores also is based on at least one of user-defined or workload-defined metrics (information can be provided by user, the program itself, or the execution of the program) ([0042]).

48. As to claim 23, Orenstien and Yamaji are explicitly silent in teaching wherein the throughput metric comprises a number of instructions per second. However, by definition, throughput is the average rate of successful message delivery over a communication channel. It is well known in the art that throughput is usually measured in bit per second, and sometimes in data packets per second or data packets per time slot. Therefore, Official Notice is taken that the throughput metric comprises a number of instructions per second. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art such that Orenstien and Yamaji's throughput metric would comprise of a number of instructions per second, as is well known so that it conforms to a standard unit.

49. As to claim 24, Yamaji teaches wherein movement of the executing computer processing jobs is constrained to occur only at operating system time slice intervals (col. 11, lines 43-45, Fig. 12, see claim 1).

50. As to claim 25, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 1 and 7.

51. As to claim 26, it is rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejection of claim 8.

52. As to claims 27-28, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 18-19, respectively.

53. As to claims 30-31, they are rejected for the same reasons as stated in the rejections of claims 22-23, respectively.

Response to Arguments

54. During patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification." *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution, and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-51 (CCPA 1969).

55. *Applicant argues that Orenstien does not teach the newly amended claim limitations.*

In response, the amendments prompted new grounds of rejections that make the arguments moot.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KENNETH TANG whose telephone number is (571)272-3772. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 6:00PM, Every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194

/Kenneth Tang/
Examiner, Art Unit 2195